



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,953	02/01/2001	Hiroshi Ono	P/647-137	9136
7590 07/20/2004			EXAMINER	
STEVEN I WEISBURD			NGUYEN, DUC M	
DICKSTEIN SI	HAPIRIO MORIN & OSI	HINSKY LLP		
1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
41ST FLOOR	•		2685	11
NEW YORK, 1	NEW YORK, NY 10036-2714			1 /
•			DATE MAILED: 07/20/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/773,953	ONO, HIROSHI			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Duc M. Nguyen	2685			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, or reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed 0) days will be considered timely. 6 from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			·			
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Ma	<u>ay 2004</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	tion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1,4-6 and 9-24 is/are pending in the a	pplication.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>17 and 18</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	✓ Claim(s) 1,4-6,9-16 and 19-24 is/are rejected.✓ Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicat	tion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
10)[10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached O	ffice Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Appl ity documents have been rec	ication No			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachmer						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		mary (PTO-413) ail Date			
3) 因 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Inform	nal Patent Application (PTO-152)			
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>9</u> .	6) Other:				

Art Unit: 2685

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 5/12/04. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-24 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claims 17-18 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The invention has separate utility such as a second interface for providing data communication with the Internet through means other than radio communication of the first interface, and the two interfaces can be selectively used for acquiring content from the Internet.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 17-18 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2685

2. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-16, 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Shimoda** et al (US 6,397,079) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (Fig. 14 and pages 1-10), hereafter, AAPA.

Regarding claim 1, Shimoda discloses a radio terminal (cellular phone) with enhanced capabilities through the use of a computer (external server) which is used for converting data into another format such as language translation or encryption functions which may not be feasibly implemented in cellular phones of relatively small size (see Abstract and col. 1, line 55 – col. 3, line 35), this would obviously comprise content acquisition, content transferring and content conversion means as claimed. However, Shimoda fails to disclose the data is acquired from the Internet network. However, such Internet acquisition is well known in the art as disclosed by AAPA (see pages 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to provide the above teaching of AAPA to Shimoda for downloading encrypt information from Internet as well, thereby providing a data conversion by the computer as claimed, for utilizing advantages of the Internet network such as low cost, global information available in real-time.

Regarding claim **4**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, it is clear that if the data does not contain encrypted data, the radio terminal would obviously decode the data without transferring the data to the computer for converting, thereby result in a determination means as claimed.

Regarding claim 5, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4 above. In addition, it is clear that when receiving a data message, the radio

Art Unit: 2685

terminal would obviously decode the header of the data message to determine whether the data message comprises encrypted information, the decoded header would read on "reconstruct in advance at least part of contents of the content" as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art to modify the above teaching of AAPA to Shimoda for decoding the header of the data message to determine whether the data message comprises encrypted information before transferring the encrypted information to the computer for decrypting, for eliminating unnecessary data transfer.

Regarding claim **6**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, it is clear that when receiving a command from user (voice activated or speech recognition dialing feature), **Shimoda** as modified would disclose the external server request and acquires the content from the Internet in response to the content acquisition request as claimed (see col. 2, line 25-40).

Regarding claims **9, 12, 19-20**, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim **10**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9 above. In addition, with the broadest reasonable interpretation, the controller or processor the radio terminal in Shimoda's reference would read on the "internal server" as claimed.

Regarding claims 11, 15, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6 above.

Regarding claims 13, 21, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 4 above.

Art Unit: 2685

Regarding claim **14**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9 above.

Regarding claim **16**, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 12 above. In addition, Shimoda discloses a cable or wireless communication as claimed (see Fig. 5, col. 3, lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 22, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 5 above.

Regarding claim 23, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9 above. In addition, it is clear that the encrypted information would be received at the computer for decryption.

Regarding claim **24**, the claim is interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6 above.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

Art Unit: 2685

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Stricklin et al (US Pat No. 5,444,869), Method and apparatus in a communication device for automatic transfer of control from an internal processor to an external computer..

5. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box A.F.

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

703-872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, please label PROPOSED or

DRAFT)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2685

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-306-4531. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (9:30 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on 703-305-4385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Duc M. Nguyen July 11, 2004